

Remarks:

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 6–9, 11, 13, 14, 25–28, and 30. Claims 2–5, 10, 12, 15–24, and 29 were previously canceled. Claims 1, 6, 9, 25, 26, and 28 are being amended to further recite the features of the invention. As a result, claims 1, 6–9, 11, 13, 14, 25–28, and 30 are pending for examination with claims 1, 6, and 25 being independent claims. The amendments made find support in the specification and do not constitute new matter.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected **claims 1, 6–9, 11, 13, 14, 25–28, and 30** under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Canon Kabushiki Kaisha (European Patent Application EP1205843A) (“Canon”) and Walbeck et al (US Patent No. 7,310,670) (“Walbeck”) and Kageyama et al (US Patent No. 5,625,757) (“Kageyama”). Applicants traverse. Even so, the Applicants have amended some of the claims to further recite the features of the invention.

With respect to the Examiner’s Response to Arguments in the FOA (pg. 10), the Examiner states:

“It is understood by the Examiner that a print spooler is merely software that controls the print jobs of a printer. All printers inherently have some type of print spooler associated with them. Therefore, the [sic] both the client and server printers taught by Canon have print spoolers.”

(FOA, pg. 11, lines 3–7; emphasis added)

Amendment

Application Number: 10/804,619

Attorney Docket Number: 306473.01

Applicants traverse. Further, Applicants claim a print spooler operating on a client and a print spooler operating on a print server, the client and the print server distinct from each other. This is significantly different than a print spooler of a printer as cited by the Examiner.

Further, the Examiner states:

“Applicant asserts that Kageyama nor Canon nor Walbeck, alone or together, disclose, teach, or suggest the Applicants’ claimed features: ...communicating print requests via an asynchronous channel between the client print spooler and the server print spooler. The examiner respectfully disagrees.” (FOA, pg. 10, portions lines 2–6)

Applicants point out that both a first communications channel and a second communications channel are claimed, both channels coupled to a client print spooler. The Examiner makes no mention of this fact and does not specifically address these two channels coupled to the client print spooler in the rejections. Applicants have amended some of the claims to further clarify these and other features of the invention.

Claim 1 has been amended to call for:

“...a client print spooler operating on the client, the applications program operable to communicate a print request to the client print spooler (8:9–10); a user interface manager operating on the client and coupled to the client print spooler (**FIG. 3, 7:11–15**); a first

Amendment
Application Number: 10/804,619
Attorney Docket Number: 306473.01

communications channel coupling, via a network, the client print spooler with a server print spooler operating on a print server, the print server distinct from the client, the print server coupled to a printer, wherein the first communications channel provides for communicating data from the application and for control of printing according to the print request (FIGs. 2, 4; 2:17–19, 7:6–10, 8:10–13); and a second communications channel coupling, via the network, the client print spooler with the print server, the second communications channel distinct from the first communication channel, wherein the client print spooler receives messages from the printer via the print server via the second communications channel, (7:12–17, 9:15–16) ...” (emphasis added; bold parenthetical references indicate at least one instance of support in the original specification.)

Claim 6 has been amended to call for:

“...a server print spooler operating on the print server, the server print spooler in communication with a client print spooler operating on a client, the communication via a first asynchronous communications channel, the client print spooler coupled to an applications program having a print capability, the applications program operable to communicate a print request to the client print spooler; wherein the client includes a user interface manager that communicates with the print server by means of a second asynchronous communications channel, the second asynchronous channel distinct from the first asynchronous

Amendment

Application Number: 10/804,619

Attorney Docket Number: 306473.01

channel, and further wherein the user interface manager responds to a user interface message sent from the print server via the second asynchronous channel...” (emphasis added.)

Claim 25 has been amended to call for:

“...providing an interface for an application to communicate with a client print spooler operating on a client which in turn communicates with a server print spooler operating on a server, the client distinct from the server, said interface enabling the application to call a service routine on the server by means of an asynchronous remote procedure call, the service routine operable to service a print request of the application, the asynchronous remote procedure call made over a first communications channel, wherein the server is a print server; and responding to language neutral messages from the server sent over a second communications channel to the client print spooler, the second communications channel being distinct from the first communications channel,...” (emphasis added.)

Applicants point out that the claimed features include, among other things, two distinct print spoolers, a client print spooler operating on a client and a server print spooler operating on a server. Further, the client print spooler is coupled to two distinct communications channels, the first channel also coupled to the server print spooler, and the second channel also coupled to the print server. Neither Kageyama nor Canon nor

Amendment

Application Number: 10/804,619

Attorney Docket Number: 306473.01

Walbeck, alone or together, disclose, teach, or suggest these and others of Applicants' claimed features.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent **claims 1, 6, and 25** are not anticipated by Canon under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), even in view of Walbeck and/or Kageyama. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Claims 7–9, 11, 13, 14, 26–28, and 30 are dependent on one of claims 1, 6, and 25. As such, claims 7–9, 11, 13, 14, 26–28, and 30 are believed allowable at least in part based upon claim 1, 6, or 25.

Request for Reconsideration

Accordingly, reconsideration and examination of the above-referenced application is requested.

Amendment
Application Number: 10/804,619
Attorney Docket Number: 306473.01

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the above application is requested. Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Amendment
Application Number: 10/804,619
Attorney Docket Number: 306473.01

AMENDMENT

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,
Microsoft Corporation

Date: November 7, 2008

By: /L. Alan Collins/

L. Alan Collins, Reg. No.: 57,646
Direct telephone (425) 703-8265
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION
(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

November 7, 2008
Date

/Noemi Tovar/
Noemi Tovar

Amendment
Application Number: 10/804,619
Attorney Docket Number: 306473.01